
El Monte Roads Environmental Assessment Scoping Report

May 12, 2003

Prepared for:
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Taos Field Office



Prepared by:
Tetra Tech, Inc.



Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	Scoping Comments and Their Disposition	2
3.0	Issue Categories	3
3.1	Alternatives.....	3
3.2	NEPA Process.....	3
3.3	Land Use.....	3
3.4	Traffic	3
3.5	Safety	4
3.6	Biological Resources	4
3.7	Water Resources	4
3.8	Out of Scope	4
3.9	Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).....	4
3.10	Scenic Resources	4
3.11	Cumulative Impacts	4
3.12	Cultural Resources.....	5
3.13	Socioeconomics	5
3.14	Document Request.....	5
3.15	Indirect Impacts	5
3.16	Mitigations	5
3.17	Recreation	5
3.18	Tribal Consultation	5
3.19	Infrastructure.....	5
4.0	Scoping Comments.....	6
4.1	Alternatives.....	6
4.2	NEPA Process.....	19
4.3	Land Use.....	24
4.4	Traffic	29
4.5	Safety	31
4.6	Biological Resources	33
4.7	Water Resources	34
4.8	Out of Scope	35
4.9	ACEC.....	35
4.10	Scenic Resources	36
4.11	Cumulative Impacts	36
4.12	Cultural Resources.....	37
4.13	Socioeconomics	37
4.14	Document Request.....	37
4.15	Indirect Impacts	37
4.16	Mitigations	38
4.17	Recreation	38
4.18	Tribal Consultation	38
4.19	Infrastructure.....	38
5.0	El Monte Right-of-way planning discussion meeting.....	38
5.1	NEPA Process Comments.....	39
5.2	Land Use Comments.....	39
5.3	Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Comments.....	39
5.4	Traffic Comment.....	39
6.0	Conclusion	39

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This *Scoping Report* incorporates all comments from the public solicited on February 5th at the public scoping meeting held at the Las Campanas Fire House in Santa Fe, NM. This report also includes written, fax, telephone, or email comments received from the public and other governmental agencies submitted to the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Taos Field Office, Taos, New Mexico. Regardless of how comments were received in the scoping process, all comments are given equal weight in this scoping report. This report was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended (42 USC 4321 et seq.) and in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508). The BLM is preparing a NEPA analysis to assess the potential environmental impacts of a proposed road access across BLM land to landlocked parcels. The applicant (El Monte Roads Association) has submitted an application for a right-of-way permit to the BLM for a right-of-way allowing legal use of BLM administered lands.

In accordance with NEPA, the BLM has decided that an Environmental Assessment (EA) will be conducted, and they are looking closely at the potential for significant impacts associated with the possible issuance of an easement.

In order to solicit comments on the EA, three media sources were utilized to help broadcast the dates and times of the public scoping meeting as well as general information about the project and who to contact for more information. The following newspapers were utilized to print the public scoping meeting notice: The Santa Fe New Mexican, The Los Alamos Monitor, and The Albuquerque Journal North.

The EA will identify and assess the individual and cumulative environmental impacts of current and reasonably foreseeable future activities related to the issuance of the proposed permit and land use. The results of the NEPA analysis will be used by the BLM in deciding whether or not to issue the requested permit. The scoping process ensures consideration of the full range of issues and alternatives that should be evaluated in the NEPA analysis and helps identify the potential for significant environmental impacts. To this end, the BLM invited interested parties, the public, Tribal governments, and governmental agencies to comment on the proposed action and those issues and alternatives which should be considered. The formal scoping period for this analysis ran from January 30, through March 2, 2003. However, the BLM will consider all additional comments received through the NEPA process as practical if they comply with 40 CFR 1502.19, 1503.3, 1503.4, 1506.6 and 516 DM 4.17.

This document contains summaries of those comments received up to the time this report was prepared in response to the public notice, *Public Scoping Meeting for the El Monte Roads Environmental Assessment*. These comments are organized by general issue categories. These issue categories are defined and discussed in Section 3 and their order in the document is based on the number of comments received within each issue category. In Section 4 each individual comment is summarized in random order by issue category.

Section 5 includes information about and comments on the El Monte Right-of-Way Planning Discussion Meeting hosted by the BLM on April 17, 2003. Section 6 presents overall conclusions of the proposed permit and the NEPA analysis.

2.0 SCOPING COMMENTS AND THEIR DISPOSITION

More than seventy-five scoping participants submitted approximately 460 comments, either by participating in the scoping meetings, or by submitting comments directly to the BLM. Most of the comments received were from individuals who mailed in comments to the BLM. However, many comments were received from individuals who attended the scoping meeting and submitted verbal comments for the record. No letters were received from Tribal governments. The BLM will review all scoping comments received.

A process has been developed to effectively and efficiently handle all comments received during the scoping process. The goal is to document that all comments are considered and are processed identically. The first step is to identify and capture the comments. Although the focus of the scoping process is to determine those issues and alternatives which should be addressed in the NEPA analysis and the level of analysis, all public input is summarized within this report. After identification, the comments are grouped by similar concerns into major issue categories. The comments and this summary document will be distributed to the NEPA Project Team, including the BLM. As the lead Federal agency for this project, the BLM will determine the appropriate scope and level of NEPA analysis.

As part of the NEPA analysis, these issues and comments will be reviewed by the BLM and evaluated for incorporation into the analysis. While issues raised by the public will be generally included in the NEPA analysis, certain comments received may be determined to be outside the scope of the analysis. The NEPA document will include a discussion of the scoping process and the disposition of scoping comments. All comments will be entered and maintained in a database designed to track and categorize each individual comment.

All scoping comments received have been grouped in the below listed categories. The categories identified during scoping and an approximate number of comments received in each category are presented below. The discrepancy between the total number of comments received and the comments as they are applied to the following categories are due to certain comments encompassing more than one category and thus counted as such in the table below.

Category	Number of Comments
Alternatives	184
NEPA Process	77
Land Use	68
Traffic	30
Safety	20
Biological Resources	14
Water Resources	13
Out of Scope	13
Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)	8
Scenic Resources	7

Cumulative Impacts	5
Cultural Resources	5
Socioeconomics	3
Document Request	3
Indirect Impacts	3
Mitigations	3
Recreation	2
Tribal Consultation	1
Infrastructure	1
TOTAL	460

The precise identification and categorization of individual comments is a somewhat subjective process, but these results closely reflect the issues raised in the comments received. Section 4.0 is a summary of the comments received under each issue category.

3.0 ISSUE CATEGORIES

3.1 ALTERNATIVES

Comments received in this category were related to the generation of reasonable alternatives to the proposed road location alternatives. Several commenters focused on the necessity to include and accept a Buckman Road access alternative. Other comments received in this category were in objection to routing the traffic associated with these landlocked parcels along Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West.

3.2 NEPA PROCESS

The comments received in this category were related to the necessary additions to documents developed as part of the NEPA process. The commenters wanted full disclosure of the risks, impacts, and plans associated with the necessity for an improved roadway. Several commenters also stated their objection to an EA and support for an EIS based significant impacts to resources.

3.3 LAND USE

Comments received in this category were primarily concerned with the potential future use of the landlocked parcels. Many commenters voiced opposition to development and objected to the routing of traffic through their neighborhoods and along their streets.

3.4 TRAFFIC

The comments received in this category were related to the impact of the project on traffic through surrounding neighborhoods. Most commenters were concerned about the impacts of additional traffic (generated from potential future development of the landlocked parcels) on safety, ways of life, noise, etc. throughout the adjacent communities.

3.5 SAFETY

The comments received in this category were related to the safety and welfare of residents living in close proximity to the project area. Most commenters were concerned that the increase in traffic associated with the proposed action would jeopardize their safety.

3.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Comments received in this category were concerned with the effects of the project on terrestrial habitat and species. Several comments focused on impacts on vegetation and habitat as a result of siting roads where proposed.

3.7 WATER RESOURCES

Comments in this category pertained to the effects of the project on water resources. Commenters were concerned about supply issues relating to the potential growth and development of lands that will be legally accessed as a result of this project.

3.8 OUT OF SCOPE

Comments received in this category were considered to be outside the scope of the NEPA analysis and therefore will receive no further attention. Twelve comments that were out of scope were received during the scoping period and they included the creation of a road maintenance association, concerns over condition of existing roads, prices of easements, etc.

3.9 AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACEC)

The comments received in this category were related to the designation by the BLM of the BLM lands in question as an ACEC. Commenters called attention to the sensitivity of the BLM lands and the generation of an application for BLM to designate the land as an ACEC. One commenter referred to the ACEC designation application document in reference and ask that the ACEC application document be viewed in total before a decision is made on the EA.

3.10 SCENIC RESOURCES

The comments received in this category were related to the impacts of the project on the scenic resources of the BLM lands in question. Comments received in this category focused on the need for careful consideration by the BLM of the impacts the proposed roads would have on scenic resources. One commenter expressed an interest in maintaining the visual character of the area.

3.11 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The comments in this category were related to the anticipated effects of the project on numerous outlying resources. Most of the comments received in this category questioned the effects of the project due to the potential changes and alterations the new roads will bring.

3.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Comments received in this category were related to the impact of the proposed roads on cultural resources and archaeological sites in the area. Several commenters expressed concern over loss or destruction of sensitive cultural sites in the project area.

3.13 SOCIOECONOMICS

The comments received in this category were concerned with the impacts to the communities and neighborhoods directly adjacent to the proposed roads. Two commenters focused on the negative impacts they felt the project would have on property values.

3.14 DOCUMENT REQUEST

Comments received in this category were related to the request for additional information or documentation with regard to the project. The commenters asked to receive additional information in support of the project as well as copies of all determinations by the BLM.

3.15 INDIRECT IMPACTS

The comments received in this category were related to the indirect effects of the project on resources. The commenters were concerned that potential future development could require road improvements that could impact the adjacent residents and resources.

3.16 MITIGATIONS

The comments received in this category were related to the mitigations that should be implemented to minimize effects from project related actions. Commenters voiced opinions that the reseeding proposed after construction would be ineffective during drought, or that the acreages calculated for reseeding were too small. Another commenter simply wanted access to be configured in a way that would result in the least damage to the environment.

3.17 RECREATION

The comments received in this category were related to the effect of the project on off-highway vehicle access. The commenters noted that the proposed improvements to roads in the area could increase illegal off-highway vehicle access resulting in degradation of a number of resources.

3.18 TRIBAL CONSULTATION

The comment received in this category was related to the impact of the project on Tribal religious and ancestor sites. The commenter requests that the SHPO and necessary Pueblos be consulted to protect the cultural resources in the area.

3.19 INFRASTRUCTURE

The comment in this category was concerned that the County of Santa Fe must be given ample time to evaluate issues related to utilities.

4.0 SCOPING COMMENTS

The following are summaries of the specific comments received in each of the separate issue categories. Issue categories in this section are ordered based on the number of comments received from highest to lowest. Specific comments within individual categories appear in random order.

4.1 ALTERNATIVES

- We understand that the land in question can be easily accessed from Buckman Road via a BLM road without having a negative impact on our neighborhood.
- We oppose the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic to the now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West.
- In considering alternative routes, the BLM should consider the fact that approximately 95% of the roadway requested by the applicants from the BLM covers existing two-track roads. The roads would need to be upgraded and improved. However, the location of the existing roads is such that their visual and environmental impact will be minimal, as the roads have been used for well over fifty years.
- We oppose using the routes of Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West to gain access to El Monte Association land.
- We request the routes come from Buckman Road to the west. It is a more direct route and the impact on traffic and neighborhoods will be less.
- La Tierra and Santa Fe Northwest Advisory Council (SNAC) spent a great amount of time analyzing potential development of the Santa Fe Northwest area, including the prospective road system. It was determined that access to the far northwest area was far better served by a road running due north from Buckman Road than through the La Tierra, La Soc, Paseo De la Tierra access.
- County road Paseo de la Tierra is a narrow, winding road that is amenable only to minimal traffic, especially truck traffic. Improvement of the road would be very expensive, and would have significant environmental impact, including changes in drainage patterns and the removal of a large amount of vegetation.
- As resident of La Tierra I am not opposed to the development of the Garcia and Ortiz properties, but feel very strongly that an alternate access road is imperative.
- Although initial road development cost may be higher for the new developments, the ultimate cost of major improvements to Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa would be substantial to both the county and existing residents. Therefore, I urge you to move toward an alternate access road off Buckman.
- The residents of La Tierra Nueva Homeowners' Association are strongly opposed to any alternative that considered the use of Buckman road to provide access for the property in question.

- The commenter would appreciate being kept informed of the status of this issue particularly if the Buckman Road alternative is favored. The La Tierra Nueva Homeowners' Association would want to mount a legal challenge to that alternative.
- We are adamantly opposed to the Garcia/Ortiz application for an easement to access their acreage by using Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West.
- Carefully evaluate use of Buckman Road.
- Paseo de la Tierra into a main arterial route will harm over 100 families and makes no sense because Buckman Road is a much less disruptive option.
- The best route is to come westward from Buckman Road where there are few homesites. Construction already is planned along on Buckman, because PNM is going to install a gas line to Pojoaque along that road. A BLM road runs from Buckman to the Garcia/Ortiz properties.
- The commenter supports option B or D due to the fact that there is already a road almost to the landlocked property.
- The commenter suggests that a compromise could be reached, to the benefit of all parties. That compromise is to give Zannie permission to build an access road branching off the Horcado Ranch Road, but require her to upgrade Paseo La Tierra from the mailboxes at its beginning to the tennis courts, where Horcado Ranch Road begins.
- I urge BLM to consider a more logical and less disruptive route to the Garcia/Ortiz properties by way of Buckman Road.
- A more environmentally sensitive route could be developed along Buckman Road.
- The commenter states he would have to support either B or D due to it's a better way to go. It won't cause as much damage to natural habitat and disturbed land.
- The commenter supports either alternative B or alternative D.
- The most reasonable solution should be that the existing road should be used up until the obstruction site, then it should go as close to the old road as possible. The following reasons should be considered: 1) These alternatives follow the existing road, 2) The environment will be least disturbed/damaged, 3) The natural habitats will not be destroyed terribly, and 4) There was no problem until one person thought they could do what he wanted to, no matter the consequences or who it might inconvenience.
- The commenter supports alternative B because it disturbs the least amount of vegetation and is already on an existing road.
- I would like to register my objection to the proposed routes for the new development near La Tierra.
- Buckman Road would be a much more realistic and practical route, as the other roads are too small and already impacted with too much traffic.
- My lot lies at the exact nexus so I feel especially vulnerable and beg your consideration of the Buckman road alternative to Zannie's development. Please

help us by promoting the entry road to Zannie's land from the west along Buckman Road instead of hammering again on Paseo de La Tierra and W. Estrada Calabasa right through the very heart of our venerable development.

- There are better, less provocative, and more practical alternatives. Please adopt them instead and leave La Tierra alone.
- We have become aware of a proposal to use Paseo la Tierra as an access to land locked areas west and north of Horcado Ranch. We have lived here 25 years and strongly oppose any of the four proposals for access that the BLM is now presenting.
- The only sensible access would be off Buckman Road beyond La Tierra Nueva where there is now a crude BLM road. The La Tierra roads are narrow, not surfaced to accommodate such volumes of traffic.
- We strongly oppose any roads that would put more traffic on Estrada Calabasa and Paseo de la Tierra.
- Also enclosed is a map with a suggestion for an alternate route highlighted in yellow. This route would not intersect established rural communities whose roads are not built for increased traffic.
- We urge you to consider alternatives to having Horcado Road feed into Estrada Calabasas and Paseo de La Tierra.
- Option B makes more sense because there was already a road there. It has less of an impact on the environment.
- Option B makes better sense because there is already an existing road and there will not be such a dramatic impact on the environment.
- I oppose BLM's proposal to grant an easement to the El Monte Association from the Horcado Ranch Road.
- BLM casually dismissed consideration of granting an easement off of Buckman Road to the west of the subject properties. However, this route has many benefits and advantages and must be thoroughly considered.
- The Buckman route would not be subject to strong community objection and would only require an environmental assessment.
- The Buckman route must be given a full review.
- The proposed easement would result in significant impacts on neighboring communities.
- BLM has failed to give serious consideration to a very viable alternate route (the Buckman Road access) because such route is rejected by the easement applicants.
- The commenter supports Alternative B or D because there is already an existing road going to the deeded property behind the Mariah Ranch. These two alternatives will do less damage to the environment than any of the other alternatives.

- If any of the other alternatives are chosen, more property will be destroyed for a new road.
- The commenter supports alternative B because it disturbs the least of the natural habitat.
- The El Monte Roads Association consisting of a single family owning 1,200 acres did not take into consideration the death trap they are creating. The adjoining roads, Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa cannot handle more developer traffic.
- The existing temporary (not legal yet) BLM access is shown on the attached map. It is a good option because it does not spill the developer's traffic onto the very dangerous Horcado and Estrada Calabasa, and Paseo de la Tierra roads. It comes from Buckman. El Monte opposes that option because of an arroyo crossing.
- Another good option from Buckman Road is also attached. For the safety of thousands of neighbors we urge you to consider the Buckman Road accesses. Buckman is already a county standard road and is easy access for future developers.
- The commenter supports alternative B because it disturbs the least of the habitat. We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road.
- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Costs include: 1) Construction of Bridge(s); 2) Ancha Formation (additional compaction for proposed road along private property).
- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Maintenance includes: 1) Who will maintain the road (County)?; 2) How will it be maintained?; 3) Construction of Bridge on County Maintained Road should address, a) Slick areas (clay), b) Drainage, c) Ancha Formation (more likely to erode).
- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Visual impacts include: 1) Destroying of landscaping of 4-5 miles; 2) Appearance of bridge; 3) Bridge could be seen for miles.
- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Environmental concerns include: 1) Ecosystem; 2) Trash dumping.
- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Grazing concerns include: 1) Grazing impacts (limitation of grazing land).
- There appear to be a number of more-direct, alternative access routes that have not been considered including existing routes (right-of-way as shown on the 7.5 minute topographic map series and/or National Forest Maps) within Alamo

Creek of the Calabasa Arroyo. These routes connect directly to Buckman Road.

- I have a hard time understanding how such routes have been proposed when prima facies evidence supports more direct access from Buckman Road, and why the BLM and the county have not looked at the bigger picture.
- Clearly, what has been proposed will have immediate negative impact on the present communities, and has potential for disastrous long-term impacts to the northwest corridor.
- The commenter supports alternative B because it disturbs less of the native vegetation.
- The commenter thinks that option B is better for the land.
- We're writing as a land owner in La Tierra to voice our strong objection to the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West.
- We agree with many that a far more environmentally safe route must be developed along Buckman Road, and that no road width over 22' be approved with a full application for development and review and approval.
- Option B makes more sense because there was a road already there and it has less of an impact on the environment.
- We are very worried about a proposal to allow easements through Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West for the El Monte Association and consider it unacceptable.
- There exists an excellent alternative, Buckman Road, which would be more practical, probably less costly and far more environmentally sound than the use of these two roads, for whatever development is envisaged.
- Please encourage all concerned to reject using the Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West for any route of this kind.
- It is difficult for us to understand why Paseo la Tierra would even be considered as an access route through to lands in the Northwest of Santa Fe County. Paseo La Tierra is already more than stressed in serving the La Tierra and Las Dos subdivisions.
- The BLM is proposing to grant a road easement to Zannie Garcia and the Ortiz family to several thousand acres of land west and north of Horcado Ranch, ripe for development.
- Why not take the alternative Buckman Road access to the west? There is already a BLM road that runs from Buckman to these properties. PNM is prepared to run its 8" gas line to Pojoaque along this route in the near future.
- Please support and vote for option B - said plan is less intrusive to vegetation.
- If BLM must grant access to the Garcia and Ortiz interests because of their landlocked properties, a much less intrusive route originating off of Buckman Road would suffice, crossing the El Monte Road Association's members' own lands and only a small distance across BLM. While this route may present

various costs to the Garcias and Ortizes, we quote BLM's letter to PNM once again: "An applicant does not gain entitlement to a particular right-of-way because alternate access may be difficult or expensive. Kirk Brown, 151 IBLA 225 (1999)."

- Under no circumstances should routing be joined to Horcado Ranch Road, Estrada Calabasa, and Paseo de la Tierra. A whole host of controversies involving environmental, safety, esthetic, and land use planning matters, as well as BLM's Title 43 obligations to adjoining properties, will explode if that route is approved.
- What is the shortest right-of-way that can be granted that will satisfy the obligation to grant access BLM has a clear obligation to deny or minimize the extent of the right-of-way, as well as a clear-cut alternative route utilizing primarily the applicants' own lands, including other lands not landlocked, and has established a well-articulated precedent for protecting this unique area that should guide all future decisions?
- I am writing to protest the proposal of the BLM to grant an easement to the El Monte Association through Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West to allow development of thousands of acres of land in northwest Santa Fe County.
- I believe there is an alternate route through the Buckman Road approach that does not adversely effect our neighborhood. This route would allow El Monte Association to proceed with their development without damaging our quality of life and the value of our investment in our home.
- The commenter supports the passage through the Ranch.
- By accessing the Garcia and Ortiz lands from Buckman Road, thereby traversing a succession of Santa Fe Ranch and Ortiz properties, only a minimal amount of right-of-way mileage would infringe on BLM. This would accomplish BLM's goal of granting legal access to the subject properties while confining almost all of the roadways to the applicants' lands.
- We request that any access be granted only off of Buckman Road.
- B or D is a better option because it will not hurt the land and natural habitat as much as the other options.
- The more practical solution would have the route come from Buckman Road to the west.
- The commenter supports alternative B. This will do little harm to none to BLM property.
- As property owners in La Tierra, we must strongly object to the request of your client, the Ortiz/Garcia family, to gain access to thousands of acres of northwest Santa Fe County, via Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West.
- The proposal presented by the Bureau of Land Management is absolutely unacceptable to the residents of our community.
- The only acceptable route would be that of Buckman Road, which of course is the most logical and least disruptive due to the physical, social, and economic

hardships that would be placed on La Tierra, Las Dos, and other neighbors directly affected.

- It is imperative that an environmentally safe route must be chosen for the logical, practical, and appropriate development of our region. Particular emphasis must be placed on water and other environmental issues.
- If approval for this proposed route is given, it will seriously and detrimentally impact Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West and the residents and environment of the surrounding areas.
- Finding areas like La Tierra and Las Dos within twenty minutes of downtown Santa Fe is becoming exceedingly rare and should not be further degraded by proposals such as the one BLM and El Monte Road Association are now considering.
- We do not object to creating access to a landlocked parcel, however when this access can be attained via Buckman Road, a route whereby fewer people and their surroundings will be affected, logic dictates that this route should be the appropriate one to take.
- A far more reasonable approach would be to grant an easement from Buckman Road, thus routing the increased traffic and activities along Camino la Tierra, an arterial road capable of handling such traffic.
- Great desirability for the Buckman Road alternative.
- People still remain amazed that Buckman Road and other alternatives were not included in the presentation. Despite the BLM's later agreement to add this option to their review, there remains the sense that this may be no more than an empty gesture, and that they will decide things the way El Monte wants them decided.
- The commenter supports the request to re-establish and improve the road as needed to access the private lands. This option makes the most sense due to the fact it would be less damage and harmful to the environment and surrounding habitat.
- I write as a landowner at Las Dos to express very considerable concern at the news regarding proposals presented to the BLM to direct traffic to the now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West.
- I request that the route come from Buckman Road to the west - a far easier and more convenient solution.
- There is an alternative way of dealing with this problem - one which we are told is extremely simple. I demand that this alternative way be seriously addressed.
- I oppose BLM's proposal to grant an easement to the Garcia and Ortiz families from the Horcado Ranch Road here in Santa Fe County.
- Although BLM has dismissed consideration of granting an easement off of Buckman Road to the west of the subject properties this route has many benefits and advantages and must be further considered.

- The Buckman route would not be subject to strong community objection and would only require an EA. It must be given a full review.
- The Arroyo Las Calabasas (one of the alternative routes) is not feasible simply because it lies on terrain that would require overwhelmingly difficult engineering accomplishments.
- It has come to my attention that the El Monte Road Association is attempting to create a road(s) which will have a severe negative impact on the entire county.
- I vehemently oppose the proposal presented by the BLM to direct traffic to the currently landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West.
- This proposal fails to consider as an alternative an access road from Buckman Road.
- There already is a BLM road that runs from Buckman Road to these properties and it would not need an EIS.
- As 26-year residents of La Tierra community northwest of Santa Fe, we are writing to oppose any use of the Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West as access to the potential development area northwest of La Tierra by the Garcia and Ortiz families.
- We strongly suggest that the logical access to the northwest of La Tierra be from Buckman Road to the west of Tierra Nueva. There is already a rudimentary BLM road running north from Buckman to that PNM is planning to use for a new gas line to Pojoaque.
- My wife and I have been residents in the La Tierra Subdivision for 13 years and strongly oppose the Garcia/Ortiz right of way using Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West as an access road to the land they have proposed to develop.
- We would hope that consideration be given to use the already existing Buckman Road. This road does not impact on the residents of La Tierra and Las Dos.
- We hope that you will urge the BLM to give strong consideration to using Buckman Road and not the Garcia/Ortiz right of way.
- While I have no objection to development per se, this proposal seems to be moving forward without the benefit of an honest environmental impact study.
- A proposed alternative of using Buckman Road from the West appears to be a better solution. It is a shorter access to the area and would require less county funds to widen the road and maintain it in the future.
- As a property owner in La Tierra, I am more than concerned by El Monte Road Associations proposal to access their land through our subdivision.
- El Monte Road Association needs to strongly consider Buckman Road as an alternative. This solution would have a much safer environmental impact in our opinion.

- An alternate route that has been suggested that would access the proposed El Monte Association development directly from Buckman Road. In my view this is by far the better option and solution for all parties concerned.
- Clearly this route (a crude BLM road that runs from Buckman Road to the El Monte Association properties) would be preferable to all concerned and I urge you and your clients to ask for an easement using this route.
- The proposed use of the narrow (22' wide) Paseo la Tierra running through the established residential area of La Tierra and providing access to Las Dos as well to serve development off Horcado Ranch Road is unacceptable.
- A much more desirable route off Buckman Road is available to serve the proposed developments of the El Monte Association.
- The environmental and social impact of perhaps thousands of additional vehicles per day on Paseo la Tierra is not acceptable when a better route exists and has already been chosen by PNM for their 8" gas line to Pojoaque after earlier neighborhood objection to the use of Paseo la Tierra. The easement for the gas line could easily be expanded to accommodate an access road for the El Monte Association.
- The proposed route from the Horcado Ranch Road will have devastating effect on the communities to the south served by Paseo de La Tierra that connects to this road.
- It is obvious that a much better route would run north from Buckman Road.
- A far more environmentally safe route must be developed along Buckman Road.
- We are writing to show our opposition to the road proposal presented by the BLM to direct traffic to a now landlocked area out Paseo La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West. Paseo La Tierra is already overused, and in dreadful condition.
- If the development is carried out, even though water is not available, a much safer route would be run through from Buckman Road.
- There have been other alternatives proposed that would preserve the beauty and environment of the area.
- Please, consider the other alternatives which would allow access to the Ortiz property such as the more environmentally safe route along Buckman Road. Do not let it be your decision that destroys yet one more part of God's creation.
- We are residents and lot owners in the Las Dos Subdivision in Santa Fe and would like to express our objection to the El Monte Association's application for a right-of-way on the BLM lands.
- There is a preferable access from Buckman Road to the property in question that will infringe only minimally on BLM land.
- Buckman Road proposal seems such an obviously superior option that one struggles to imagine why it was not included in the original recommendation.

- This route (Buckman Road) would also in all likelihood eliminate a number of problematic issues. However, for some reason this route has not been seriously considered by the BLM.
- Alternate routes are to be examined to see if the impact on the U.S. government land and on other interested persons can be minimized.
- I object strongly to the proposed routes along Camino de la Tierra.
- I request that the selected route to the private land originate from Buckman Road to the west of Tierra Nueva.
- We understand that PNM plans to run its 8" gas line to Pojoaque along an existing crude BLM road there, that can and should provide the alternate routing.
- We strongly oppose the BLM proposal to route traffic from the Garcia/Ortiz access through the La Tierra subdivision and request adoption of the alternate off of Buckman Road.
- Because this proposal may greatly affect our neighborhood and the quality of life we so much enjoy in New Mexico, we strongly object to any right-of-way that would rely on Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa as a connecting route to Santa Fe.
- We support any alternate proposals such as the Buckman Road route plan.
- As the holder of the right-of-way which El Monte proposes to use for their access, SNIC occupies a special place in demanding that the BLM not allow this access.
- Rather than granting any new roads, the BLM should ensure that no additional roads or traffic, of any nature, be allowed to enter upon Horcado Ranch Road.
- A multi-use BLM right-of-way is an anomaly in that there is a governmentally created and government sanctioned multi-use road where no one has the right or ability to police or otherwise administer the road. There is no one to establish, police, or enforce any speed or safety on the road.
- Where the BLM does not have the resources or ability to fulfill their obligations to enforce, the BLM should not allow an increased burden.
- Where the BLM was part and parcel of creating a limited use road, the BLM has an obligation to not allow that limited use to be exceeded.
- By this letter, being copied to the BLM, we request that BLM not only reject the applied for right-of-way, but ensure that no use be allowed to cross BLM lands in any greater amount than at present.
- The El Monte proposal does not disclose any current plan to erect buildings or otherwise change the use of their lands. Therefore there has been no expressed need for BLM to vary the access -- the access that still exists, and any new access.
- As stated by Mr. Baca, BLM, in a letter written about a ROW right in our area: "Our policy has been to issue ROW's across public land to access private property only when there is no alternative." Since there are several other

alternatives, including an alternative which crosses almost exclusively private land, the El Monte Application must be rejected.

- Alternate Access on Private Land: For ease of reference, we label the various El Monte landholdings as follows: WEST 1: Land controlled by a member of El Monte, approximately 300+ acres, located in Sec.17, a few hundred feet east of Buckman Road. This land has already been improved with new roads which access from Buckman Road. WEST 2: land controlled by a member of El Monte, 640 acres, a few hundred feet east of #1. This land has already been improved with new roads which access from Buckman Road. WEST 3: land controlled by a member of El Monte, 1,280 acres, 640 acres abut WEST 2 and share a one-mile common border. NORTH 1: land controlled by a member of El Monte, 398 acres, to the northeast of WEST 3, with touching corners. If one identifies these lands on a map it is immediately obvious that the road(s) on WEST 2 can extend through WEST 3 without touching public land. If this route is extended northeast it can access NORTH 1, and to "jump" the corner use less than 3% of one acre -- a total of 1,250 square feet of public land.
- It does not seem practical to use the proposed route of Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West. Setting aside the enormous impact such development is going to have on our environment. Particularly water use, it does not seem either practical to use this route as access.
- I am writing to BLM director and the Santa Fe County Commission to consider an alternative route along Buckman Road.
- I am writing in support of Option 2 because extensive study has been done on this option that shows it is a viable choice.
- I am writing to voice my opposition to the new suggested alternative route suggested by Gabrielle Burke along the side of Calabasas Arroyo.
- With regard to the suggested route along the arroyos, my complaint is that a road built on the side of the arroyo will not last but in fact will wash out. If the main arroyo doesn't wash surely it is also possible that all the side arroyos will wash out.
- It is not environmentally sound to build a bridge over the arroyo. A dip section will surely wash out.
- I am writing in support of option 2 because it was one of the options agreed upon by the Burkes and Garcias.
- I am writing in support of option 2. In the main part it follows existing roads so the environmental impact will be minimum. It is the most direct route and so the shortest route and therein also has the least environmental impact.
- The Buckman route suggested by Mrs. Burke does not provide access to the deeded land of Mrs. Garcia. It only runs along the side of the Ortiz property.
- I am writing in support of option 3 because it was one of the options agreed upon by the Burkes and Garcias.
- We are asking for a road right of way. The topic at hand is not a subdivision.

- Mrs. Burke's new road contemplates some access between the Ortizes on each family's deeded land. The Ortizes are not prepared to give each other any access on their own deeded land.
- I object to the letter sent by the La Tierra Neighborhood Association Board on February 13, 2003. The topic at hand is a road right of way not the construction of houses so the comments based on this letter are beside the point and not to the road issue.
- I object to the letter sent by the La Tierra Neighborhood Association Board on February 13, 2003. The road that the Burkes have suggested they would like would not more easily accomplish a route to the deeded land. The Burke's suggestion is a new 4-mile road over BLM land versus the Ortiz/Garcia suggestion which is along old roads and the request is simply to widen them to 24 feet. Therefore the reverse is true. The roads suggested through Buckman would have an environmental impact that is far greater.
- If the alternative route via the Buckman Road is chosen, a new road approximately 4 miles will have to be constructed. This is in comparison to the routes already in consideration which are almost entirely on existing roads. There is no need to build a new road on the side of and across an arroyo. The proposed new roads via Buckman will cause substantially more disturbances than the roads now existing.
- I am writing in support of option 3 because extensive study has been done on this option that shows it is a viable choice.
- I am not at all in favor of the proposed roads through Horcado Ranch Road and thus Estrada Calabasa and Paseo de la Tierra, and am backing the alternative Buckman Road.
- A far more environmentally safe route must be developed along Buckman Road.
- I strongly oppose the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic to the now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West.
- A logical, ecologically friendly and safer alternative already exists in Buckman Road.
- We strongly oppose the proposal presented by the BLM to direct traffic to the now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West.
- A far more environmentally safe route must be developed along Buckman Road.
- Why not choose an access off Buckman Road? Clearly a better choice. The Buckman Road access is clearly the best option for the greatest number of people. I will vigorously oppose any plan that routes traffic down Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West.
- The commenter thinks option B makes more sense because there's an already existing road. There will be less of a dramatic impact on the environment.

- I'm writing to render my most strenuous objection to the routing of access to the proposed BLM easement/road to the El Monte development along Paseo de la Tierra.
- There is a much superior and less controversial alternative to Paseo de La Tierra - Buckman Road - which may not even be under consideration.
- Buckman Road passes through a mostly unpopulated area and would not have the environmental or public safety impact that would be felt as a result of the Paseo de La Tierra routing.
- Buckman Road passes through largely unforested areas, unlike Paseo de La Tierra, and could provide an emergency outlet for residents of La Tierra, Las Dos, and El Monte in the event of a fire near Paseo de La Tierra.
- Compared to the total cost of developing El Monte, the additional cost of the Buckman Road routing would be relatively insignificant and would in no way compare to the environmental and safety cost of the Paseo de La Tierra route.
- I don't understand why the BLM would not prefer the Buckman routing.
- The two alternate proposed routes that intersect the existing black-checked road as circled on the enclosed project map present a serious safety hazard.
- Please find an alternate to these two.
- The routes through Buckman Road cross very hilly and difficult terrain which would require substantially more visible and environmental disturbance at much higher cost, financially and environmentally.
- Nothing was mentioned at the scoping meeting about the impact to the environment that new road construction would cause. We believe that our proposed route will have considerably less environmental impact than the proposed Buckman Road alternative.
- Gabriella and Larry Burke's comments during the meeting were inappropriate and violated a court decree forbidding them to do so. Gabriella Burke openly advocated the alternative route and even produced a map to show what we wanted.
- The commenter is asking that a correct decision be made, namely that the Buckman Route be reviewed and approved. This is the only decision that can be responsibly made given the Secretary's mandate to prevent the degradation of federal property, to protect the concerns of interested persons, to strictly follow the regulations and purpose of NEPA, and to strictly follow the regulations and purpose of NHPA. The Buckman Road route would provide access to the applicants without cutting through the heart of federal land and turning neighborhood access roads into high-speed thoroughfares.
- Granting such a proposal would turn our neighborhood roads - Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa, and Horcado Ranch Road - into an arterial highway, destroy areas of pinon and juniper trees, and gravely affect the tranquility and quality of life we have now.

- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Hazards include 1) Arroyo Crossing (flooding); 2) Speed control (no signage); 3) ATV's/Dirt Bikes, Off-Road Vehicles (no designated area for use); 4) On-going discharge of firearms; 5) Erosion; 6) Emergency vehicle access; 7) Standing water (rainy season)/lagoon; 8) Vandalism.
- The existing black-checked road (the Horcado Road) is a one-lane road. It is dangerous as it is now used for two-way traffic. It will only become more dangerous if new traffic is added, especially if the traffic includes cement trucks, gravel trucks, and other construction type traffic.
- I am writing in support of option 3 because it will have the least visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood.
- I am writing in support of option 2 because it will have the least visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

4.2 NEPA PROCESS

- The identical issues are involved in the proposed road system and the same threats to the integrity of this Area of Critical Environmental Concern are present. No development in this tract should be allowed, or at minimum, an EIS should be required in order to insure that no irreversible damage is inflicted on the land.
- An Environmental Impact Statement would enable BLM to make an informed determination, thereby assuring the public that no right-of-way was granted in haste in an Area of Critical Environmental Concern and that our natural resources have been protected in a deliberate manner.
- The pending request for declaring this area one of "Critical Environmental Concern" could provide much of the needed information for an environmental impact statement.
- The commenter is asking that a correct decision be made, namely that the Buckman Route be reviewed and approved. This is the only decision that can be responsibly made given the Secretary's mandate to prevent the degradation of federal property, to protect the concerns of interested persons, to strictly follow the regulations and purpose of NEPA, and to strictly follow the regulations and purpose of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The Buckman Road route would provide access to the applicants without cutting through the heart of federal land and turning neighborhood access roads into high-speed thoroughfares.
- We are requesting extensive public involvement and review of this proposal and a full environmental impact statement regarding traffic and growth in the neighborhood.
- Mr. Knox indicated that SWCA, the contractor hired to prepare the EA, was not competent to complete the work required for right of way request. It was not clear what Mr. Knox meant by this comment, but he seemed to think that an EIS would be required for the project as a result of the meeting. We request

that you advise us immediately of any competency problems with SWCA so that any deficiencies in the application, or the contractor, can be remedied.

- We suggest that the BLM has ample evidence to support an EA determining that there is no significant environmental impact resulting from the road requested by applicants. The BLM should issue a finding to this effect at the earliest possible time, so that the road application, now in process for over two years, can be granted.
- There should be an environmental impact statement regarding the effects of the heavy road building and resulting increase in vehicle traffic and noise. What are the noise, pollution, hydrology, and other impacts?
- It is imperative that the public have some involvement in the review of this proposal addressing environmental concerns and growth impact on neighboring communities.
- We would request a full EIS along with extensive public involvement and review.
- Because of the significant potential impact on the community, an environmental impact statement must be performed if the Horcado Road route is to be further considered.
- I ask that you request BLM to give full and thorough consideration to the Buckman Road access route. If that route is rejected by BLM, then a full EIS must be performed for the proposed Horcado Ranch Road easement.
- Please demand additional time to involve the public, request a full environmental impact statement and be sure that the Santa Fe County's Land Use Department is involved.
- Given possible development plans by the Pueblos to the north, it is clear that a more thorough and encompassing environmental and land development study is required before serious consideration be given to the new roundabout routes that have been proposed by the BLM.
- We want to join our neighbors in demanding extensive public involvement and review, along with a full EIS to consider traffic and growth impacts on neighboring communities with the request justified on the historical growth of the area almost entirely driven by the applicant Garcia.
- There should be extensive public involvement and review before anything is decided. A full EIS to consider traffic and growth impacts on neighboring communities is absolutely mandatory. This action is justified by the fact that the historical growth of this area has been almost entirely driven by the applicant, Garcia, and the Ortiz family, co-applicants.
- We residents find it unacceptable that the BLM seems to be ready to approve Garcia's proposals and ignore the concerns of the residents of La Tierra and Las Dos.
- Requested a copy of the POD that was written by Walbridge and Associates.
- An Environmental Impact Statement should be required.
- It is particularly appropriate that the County's Land Use Department have a full opportunity to generate its own recommendations, after open public debate and input.

- Master planning by the County is essential before BLM makes a de facto determination of all of these secondary issues by selecting the access route unilaterally.
- Our Board of Directors (Las Dos) requests that these concerns be given careful consideration, particularly in the context of the significant implications this proposal has on the future growth of the northwest sector, which to date has been generated almost entirely by the efforts of applicant Zannie Garcia.
- We request that an EIS be required.
- We request that Santa Fe County's Land Use Department be incorporated into the decision-making process, with appropriate public hearings.
- We request a full EIS to assess the impact of the traffic and growth on our neighborhoods. We further urge that no action be taken without extensive public involvement and review.
- There is obvious need for an EIS.
- There was little public notice of that meeting. Many who did come were unprepared for the scale of the plan.
- BLM was planning to change the face of this region forever with an informal - almost casual- presentation that seemed more appropriate, say, to a discussion of what colors new road signs might be.
- Everyone I have spoken with concurs there should be much more open discussion, including public dialog with the El Monte principals themselves.
- I request extensive public involvement in the matter and review as well as a full EIS to consider traffic and growth impacts on neighboring communities.
- Because of the significant potential impact on the community, an EIS must be performed if the Horcado Road route is to be further considered.
- We are concerned that some individuals are trying to incite opposition to the requested road by making false statements to force an EIS. We feel that this antagonistic person with his false comments is quite simply trying to use scare tactics to stop this road at any cost.
- Don't those who are impacted have a right to public involvement and review as well as a full EIS for the BLM's proposed easements off of Horcado Ranch Road considering traffic and growth impacts on our neighboring communities?
- A full county review and an environmental impact study should be conducted, with open public involvement, before any decision is made on the placement of an access road.
- I am requesting that an environmental impact study be performed considering both the water and other infrastructure issues. Further, I request that this study also encompass the Buckman road alternative for comparison.
- I can tell you that without the proper environmental impact study and property owners' involvement, your clients are going to be in for tremendous opposition.
- We request that a full EIS be completed with regard to this proposed easement and that such EIS consider the traffic and overall growth impact on the La Tierra neighborhood.
- I would also ask that the Garcia's and Ortiz's, the El Monte Association, provide for extensive public (neighbor) involvement and review and

furthermore that they be involved in this personally so that they might better understand and show respect for their neighbors' concerns about their plans.

- There is a need for a full EIS to be done by the BLM for the proposed easements off Horcado Ranch Road.
- An EIS is absolutely necessary because of the considerable impact these easements will have on the neighboring communities. Such a study would address the very serious problem of water availability for future large-scale developments as well as the inevitable noise and air pollution a large increase of vehicular traffic would entail.
- I strongly request extensive public involvement and review of the land owner's requests, the BLM agreements, and the role of the County in planning and coordinating the various competing motivations behind the present secret agreements.
- Certainly, as a minimum, this easement should be granted only after extensive public involvement and review as well as a full EIS to consider the likely increase in traffic and its effect on neighboring communities as well as full consideration of alternative routes.
- We demand extensive public involvement and review, request a full environmental impact statement to consider traffic and growth impacts on neighboring communities.
- I ask that a full EIS be done.
- It is our understanding that an EIS concerning the request has not been completed. It is imperative that one be done before any decision on the request be made.
- Additionally Santa Fe County's Land Use Department should be part of the decision process and public hearings concerning this proposal should be held.
- I am told that BLM and El Monte have been working on this proposal for more than a year before inviting any public comment. For BLM to proceed in a furtive manner - recklessly, in secret, as though BLM were in an unspoken pact with El Monte developers and their lavishly paid agents - would seem to violate the spirit if not the letter of BLM's character.
- We need to know what BLM is deciding, what criteria are being used to make judgments, what timetables are being followed, and precisely what options are available to affected citizens and neighborhoods to comment on and/or appeal any BLM decision.
- I urge that you provide an opportunity for extensive public involvement and review.
- I request a full EIS to consider traffic and growth impacts on neighboring communities.
- We are further alarmed that while BLM has had the request for more than a year, it was February of this year (2003) that a BLM meeting was held, with little if any public notification, to "get comments from the public."
- A decision using the Buckman routing would probably not require an EIS.
- If BLM does not adopt the Buckman Road alternate, or simply carries it as an option, we request extensive public involvement and review, plus a full EIS.

- Additional expenses by BLM and associated litigation can be avoided by adopting the route from Buckman Road early on. We urge our Congressional representatives to intervene with BLM on this matter.
- We do support a full environmental impact study/statement that will consider growth and traffic impact on these communities.
- If this application will not be merely rejected, the BLM should direct a full EIS.
- An application which seeks new 50' and 100' roads to access several thousand acres of new development is certainly deserving of an EIS.
- We need not remind the BLM that the government agency must take into account "reasonable and likely future actions," and the agency "must examine connected actions." As well, the Agency "must look at the next phases" and "potential development." Once the briefest glance is taken at the thousands of acres we refer to, there can be no doubt that this application involves a "major impact on the human environment."
- I am further urging them to require an environmental impact report.
- Mr. and Mrs. Burke closed off the existing road to my deeded land by building their house in the center of the road. We reached a settlement in court that I should get new access and I am obligated to abide by and fulfill all the existing federal regulations to get such a road. I intend to do so. In the settlement, the Burkes agreed not to oppose the BLM process for obtaining a new right of way. The Burkes are violating the settlement agreement. Because of this, I believe Mrs. Burke's suggestion of an alternative access route down to Buckman Road cannot stand because she is prevented from interfering with our obtaining a right of way.
- Mr. Kirschenbaum raised the topic that the County of Santa Fe Master Plan is required before an access easement can be granted. This statement is not supported by law. In fact, SNAC did a sector plan that was accepted by the county a few years ago.
- As a resident of La Tierra, we demand extensive public involvement and review, and we request a full environmental impact statement to consider traffic and growth impacts on neighboring communities.
- We ask for outright rejection of El Monte's application, or a much more expanded disclosure by El Monte followed by much greater analysis by BLM and stakeholders.
- Are there additional opportunities for public to comment on project? On conclusions?
- Should this be an EIS?
- Can you require a county master plan before the EA is continued?
- Concern that a decision has already been made.
- Can BLM grant access based on use?
- Will decision disclose all alternatives, proposals, etc...?
- Did El Monte create road alternatives alone?
- I am informed that there was a public hearing on this matter earlier this month. I received no notice of it, even though I am a property owner in both of the most impacted communities.

- By this letter and copies to those indicated, I am requesting that the BLM conduct a full environmental, traffic, and public safety impact study on the proposed Paseo de La Tierra routing.
- I believe that such a study (EIS) will prove that the Paseo de La Tierra routing would be dangerous and disruptive to the existing communities of La Tierra and Las Dos and that the Buckman Road alternative would be much more advantageous to the public interest.
- We strongly object to the scope and nature of the proposed roads and wish to present our objections to you for your consideration and for purposes of establishing a record for appeal if BLM grants the right-of-way as proposed.
- Mr. Kirschenbaum raised the issue that a County of Santa Fe master plan is required before an access easement can be granted. This is not the law. Mr. Kirschenbaum's argument should not be used as a basis for denying the application or forcing us to prepare an EIS.
- A full EIS should be conducted and the regulations under NHPA should be followed which includes contact with State Historic Preservation Officer and appropriate tribes and Pueblos whose religious sites and ancestor sites may be significantly impacted.

4.3 LAND USE

- The routes through Buckman Road cross very hilly and difficult terrain which would require substantially more visible and environmental disturbance at much higher cost, financially and environmentally.
- Nothing was mentioned at the scoping meeting about the impact to the environment that new road construction would cause. We believe that our proposed route will have considerably less environmental impact than the proposed Buckman Road alternative.
- Gabriella and Larry Burke's comments during the meeting were inappropriate and violated a court decree forbidding them to do so. Gabriella Burke openly advocated the alternative route and even produced a map to show what we wanted.
- If a head count is to be considered in analyzing the results of the meeting (scoping meeting), it should be noted that of the 37 participants at the meeting, at least 18 were people who supported the project.
- Zannie Garcia does not intend to further divide her land from its existing eight lots. The Ortiz family will commit not to seek any lot size smaller than twenty acres. Much of the Ortiz property will consist of much larger tracts, probably as much as fifty or sixty acres each.
- A Mr. Thomas Blog submitted a letter to you contending that the route proposed by the applicants would still leave the Ortiz/Walker group landlocked. Mr. Blog's letter is based on the premise that there is no legal right of the Ortiz/Walker group to cross the Klopfer property. Mr. Blog's premise is incorrect and unsupported by the public data which he presents. The Ortiz/Walker group has used the road over the Klopfer property for well over fifty years and has a right of access through this property established many years ago.

- Mr. Blog refers to "anecdotal evidence that the applicants are aware they will not have unfettered access to a public road via the requested route." The evidence is a request made to the Klopfers to grant a written easement to the Ortiz/Walker group. The request made to the Klopfers was made to clarify, not to establish, existing rights to the road.
- Commenter reiterated concern about 50-foot right-of-way. Still thinks it means thousands of people will be using the downstream roads.
- No less than 15 property owners currently use the road over the Klopfer land for access to their properties. Mr. Blog is trying to cloud and confuse the issue. Mr. Blog's argument, even if true, is not a proper basis for denying the Ortiz/Walker right-of-way application.
- The commenter is concerned about using taxpayer property and funds to provide access to private lands for the purpose of improving the owner's property value through commercial development.
- It is wrong for another development to overturn over 2 decades of responsible behavior for the sake of a development cartel.
- You ask what use the public lands in this area are put to. It is the most beautiful area for horseback riding - a luxury that very few people enjoy today.
- The commenter thinks that 28 acres is a little steep, but it will help in various situations.
- Commenter was concerned about the possibility that the road may be gated and locked.
- While the applicants may have certain engineering issues on their own lands, we do not believe that BLM is required to take into account the topography of the applicants' private land or their costs of development when making the decision as to how to grant legal access.
- The location of the right-of-way will determine the route of a major arterial road in Santa Fe County.
- Because the right-of-way will not only create access to landlocked properties, but also will afford a convenient access to Santa Fe for an additional 1600 acres owned by Zannie Garcia or Santa Fe Ranch, the scope of this request is far greater than the landlocked properties alone.
- What is meant by "degree of access" and "reasonable use and enjoyment of the non-Federal land"?
- Santa Fe County should address this proposal's implication with regard to its master development plan.
- We request that the access road not connect in any way to Horcado Ranch Road, Estrada Calabasa, or Paseo de la Tierra.
- Commenter requested that Ortiz and Garcia families make clear what their intentions are.
- No one objects to development, per se.
- There are many people that support the ROW and very few that are opposed to the road. I would like to go on record that my family and I support the road. This road is not only necessary to get to our private property, it is also essential in maintaining our ranching operation, to locate cattle, and to get to our leased property.

- A copy of a master plan was requested when in fact we cannot even apply for one with the county until we have a road to our private property. However, should a subdivision be developed, we would have to comply with Santa Fe county regulations regarding lot sizes and water restrictions.
- Santa Fe County will not approve the road without the two spurs (North and South Spurs). Therefore, in order to meet Santa Fe County regulations we must have a main road and two spurs as designed and survey and included in the POD.
- There was some concern voiced about the need for a wider road. One individual even mentioned that we should only need a 16-foot road to transport our cattle, implying that anything more proved our sinister intent. We need a larger road to accommodate our associations' family members and we understand that county standards require such dimensions for twelve or more members. The truth is that the El Monte Road Association has twenty family members who could potentially build homes and use the road; therefore, that alone is justification for the need of a wider road.
- We consider the Ortiz's and Garcia's (who own and operate the El Monte Association) to be our neighbors. I understand their desire to seek development of these properties but ask that they consider the negative impact to their existing neighbors if access to this proposed new development were to come through La Tierra residential streets.
- We feel this fragile BLM land which we so enjoy should be protected from road development in the area requested.
- There needs to be a hard analysis on the effects of this proposed route, the impact it has on the environment, upon neighboring lands, and upon the land which is held in trust by the BLM.
- Illegal dumping takes place on a regular basis. The BLM does not have the resources or ability to do anything about this.
- El Monte have been creating new access roads (not the routes applied for) without permission, and merely by repeatedly driving over BLM property.
- In addition, El Monte has placed barbed wire, and padlocked gates, denying the public access to roads that have historically existed.
- The BLM is duty bound to not only look at the lands in question as grazing land, but to contemplate the maximum use which the El Monte can create.
- It has been pointed out that El Monte could conceivably place 673 houses on the lands that they have identified in their proposal. What has not been disclosed by El Monte is that their members own or control an additional several thousand acres in the same vicinity, which cannot be ignored by the BLM on this application.
- As homeowner in the Las Dos Phase Three subdivision I vehemently object to a road easement across BLM land being granted to Zannie Garcia and the Ortiz family to develop their lands west and north of Horcado Ranch.
- I am writing to make it clear that my request is just to widen the existing roads to 24 feet it is not to create new roads.

- I have no immediate intention of developing my property. Although the property was subdivided into six lots by the BLM in 1923, I have no intentions of re-subdividing the property, developing the property, or selling the property.
- It is clear that if approved, El Monte's impact on these lands will be much greater than PNM's request for a 60-foot easement for a buried pipeline through these lands.
- It is our contention that the route proposed, even if granted by BLM, would not solve the applicants' fundamental problem of being land locked, primarily the Ortiz/Walker section. As such, the application as submitted must be denied. 1) A brief review of the history of Section 36 will illustrate the problem for the applicants. 2) While the application deals with sections 1,11,12,13,14,T18N, R8E (incorrectly listed as R9E in the applicant's Legal Descriptions), the fundamental problem of land locked access occurs in section 36, where Horcado Ranch Road crosses the Klopfer property (recorded as document #498,076) using the platted private 50' utility and access easement to connect to the public county road Estrada Calabasa. 3) Finally, a search of the Santa Fe County Grantor/Grantee records does not show any grant of use of this private 50' access easement to Walker or Ortiz. Hence, whatever BLM does 'upstream', the majority of the applicants will still be land locked...Since the stated goal of the applications cannot be achieved, BLM must deny this application until the applicants change the goal, route, or prove the only barrier to access lies within BLM's domain to solve.
- What is the end objective of accessing land in project area? Commenter is hesitant/scared based on talk of development. Why not Buckman Road as access?
- Are applicants for a right of way responsible for maintenance regardless of change in use?
- Is the easement for this project going to be granted exclusive or non-exclusive?
- How many houses can be placed on acreage?
- Do property owners have objection to Buckman Road access?
- Concern over requirements to maintain an illegal road which allows access to a legal road.
- To reconstruct Paseo de La Tierra to accommodate this increased traffic would destroy the rural atmosphere that attracted property owners to the area in the first place.
- New Mexico State University was fortunate to recently acquire the grazing lease for the Santa Fe Ranch. The university is establishing an important teaching, research, and extension education capability on these lands that will benefit not only the citizens of the region, but of the entire state.
- The proposal of a new arterial corridor from Buckman Well Field to the east causes grave concerns to NMSU. The proposed corridor would have many potentially negative impacts on the utilization of those lands for research and extension education activities. Since those lands are public lands and not intended for disposition and development by the BLM, the development of this expensive and difficult corridor cannot, in our opinion, be justified.

- We urge the resolution of the Horcado Ranch Road issue. This historic public access route has served the needs of the area for many years, is already sited on most favorable terrain and does not result in the negative impacts certain to be associated with the proposed corridor. NMSU opposes the proposed alternative arterial corridor to the existing Horcado Ranch Road and would request consideration of these comments by the Arterial Roads Task Force.
- I think we need a right of way in to our land.
- Can there be access to the north?
- The existence of potential alternative access through Buckman Road was raised by several participants at the meeting, including Mrs. Gabrielle Burke. The proposed alternate route was suggested, and rejected, in the course of settling the lawsuit by the Burkes against the Garcias and the BLM. The route was rejected because it requires that a road be built on or over a huge arroyo and, under any alternative, requires destruction of much more vegetation.
- Commenter is worried about development on the properties and extra traffic on poorly maintained roads.
- This proposal threatens the open space environment with the potential of development, increased traffic flow through La Tierra and neighboring communities. Not to mention the potential safety issues.
- If the owners' intent is to develop a residential area then the demands on our non-renewable and depleting water supply would be extremely objectionable.
- We do not oppose some development in NW Santa Fe County but actually, with such limited water, we can't imagine more development at this time.
- Although we do not oppose development per se in Santa Fe County, we have to be sure that concerns over water and other environmental issues are addressed before a drastic, lifestyle-changing decision such as this is made.
- While we do not oppose the development of this land per se, we have concern regarding the impact of this development on the environment and particularly on the water resources of the area.
- It is not a question of opposing development per se but - at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues - it is a question of being sure the impact on the whole county is understood.
- The water situation is critical as we all know and the subdivisions that were creating years ago were designed to limit the land use and not allow for major population developments.
- Let us stress that we do not oppose growth in northwest Santa Fe per se, although the impact on water supply of such growth must also be taken into account in any decision of this nature.
- We do not oppose development per se in northwest Santa Fe County, but at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues, we must be sure we understand the impact on the entire county.
- I do not oppose development per se in northwest Santa Fe County, but - at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues - we must be sure we understand the impact on the entire county.

- We do not oppose development per se in northwest Santa Fe County, but at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues, we must be certain we understand the impact on the entire county.
- We strongly object to the scope and nature of the proposed roads and wish to present our objections to you for your consideration and for purposes of establishing a record for appeal if BLM grants the right-of-way as proposed.
- Mr. Kirschenbaum raised the issue that a County of Santa Fe master plan is required before an access easement can be granted. This is not the law. Mr. Kirschenbaum's argument should not be used as a basis for denying the application or forcing us to prepare an EIS.
- This in turn will adversely affect the property values which are based upon this quiet lifestyle, not to mention the almost certain degradation of the environment.
- There are transportation, utilities, and water issues that militate strongly in favor of the Buckman Road alternative and BLM should give the County ample time to evaluate the broader effects of BLM's choices.

4.4 TRAFFIC

- A great deal of surveying of animals and plants in the Buckman corridor has been done, and the existing roads were not much of a migration barrier. Increasing traffic might constitute such a barrier.
- Commenter is worried about development on the properties and extra traffic on poorly maintained roads.
- This proposal threatens the open space environment with the potential of development, increased traffic flow through La Tierra and neighboring communities. Not to mention the potential safety issues.
- I would like to express my opposition for the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic to sections 2, 10, and 15 of T18N, R8E through Paseo la Tierra. Given the potential amount of acreage that could be developed and would be serviced by the proposed access roads, this routing of traffic would greatly exceed the capabilities of Paseo la Tierra, creating a safety hazard for the residents of the La Tierra and Las Dos subdivisions.
- The commenter was very concerned to read of the attempt to force Zannie to build an access road to her property branching off Buckman Road. While I sympathize with the residents of Las Dos about increasing traffic on their twisting and narrow access road, I strongly feel that this is the lesser of two evils. The road corridor already exists, and traverses, for most of its length, populated areas.
- Traffic on such a thoroughfare could increase tenfold, particularly if the Garcia/Ortiz land were to be developed.
- If these lands were fully developed in the same manner as Mrs. Garcia's other developments (La Mariposa, Tierra de Oro, Salva Tierra, and Las Campanas), traffic planning data suggests that there could be between 11,800 and 15,734 vehicle trips per day. This level of traffic, or anything approaching it, should not be introduced onto our low speed limit, driveway-lined streets, nor should it

be introduced into the heart of BLM's lands over miles of what are now only unobtrusive and primitive jeep paths.

- If Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West are left at their current size, they will not accommodate the increase traffic that surely will arise from the development of the thousands of acres of land being accessed.
- Granting this easement would result in excessive traffic along Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa.
- Commenter is concerned about potential traffic on existing roads.
- In part this comes about since increased traffic would change forever the way it feels to be in La Tierra. The increase in cars, trucks, noise, and fossil fuel emissions will tarnish the experience of living here.
- Commenter claims he has permitted ROW as of 1994 to part of Horcado Ranch Road from end of private land to Camino del (Cortez ??). Commenter says he is doing all the maintenance on this section and doesn't want extra traffic.
- There is already very heavy traffic on the road through La Tierra to Las Dos, traffic which can be slow and cumbersome and which hampers everything which is stuck behind it.
- The calculations for traffic numbers under the new proposals are nothing short of horrifying: the numbers would make life impossible in La Tierra and Las Dos and widening of roads would only lead to a multiplication of the same wretched effects.
- I am writing on behalf of my family to let you know that we are opposed to any proposal and/or easement that would direct such increased volumes of traffic along these pastoral residential roads.
- This proposed network would include existing subdivision roads named Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West, which travel through long established neighborhoods. Traffic planning data suggests that there could be between 11,800 and 15,734 vehicle trips per day once the El Monte land is developed. The impact of this huge traffic increase on the La Tierra neighborhood is undeniable.
- The additional thousands of vehicles traveling through La Tierra each day would result in unacceptable environmental impact.
- During 1994 and 1995, pursuant to understandings with BLM and Santa Fe County, SNIC improved Horcado Ranch Road (as well as roadways on the private lands of Garcia and Mr. and Mrs. Edward Klopfer) to a limited use standard -- a Limited Use standard because the ROW was not expected to have a great amount of traffic.
- El Monte cannot increase the burden on Horcado Ranch Road.
- Any additional traffic, which would certainly be created by new fifty foot and one hundred for wide roads running into Horcado Ranch Road, would increase the traffic far beyond the present capacity of Horcado Ranch Road, and would increase the maintenance far beyond anything contemplated by the various government agencies when Horcado Ranch Road was improved.
- With the addition of the traffic for the Garcia and Ortiz development, both (Paseo La Tierra and Estrada Calabasas) would have to be improved substantially by the county.

- I am writing regarding the BLM proposal that would grant access to the El Monte Association lands via the existing roads, Paseo de La Tierra and Estrada Calabasa West, northwest of the city of Santa Fe...The significant increase in traffic will mean the destruction of a quiet, semi-rural lifestyle which has prevailed in this small section of the county for the last twenty years, despite surrounding developments.
- What does law require for minimum road width? Is proposed width necessary?
- The environmental impact on the BLM property would be major with high speed traffic traveling across a 50-foot right of way in the middle of pristine property. The damage would be to trees, grasses, and other vegetation. Wildlife would be affected and options for future use of the BLM land would be significantly compromised.
- The commenter is particularly fearful of the impact of increased traffic on Buckman Road, and of off-road vehicles in the hills accessible along it.
- Using these La Tierra roads would heavily increase traffic through what is now a quiet, settled neighborhood, resulting in danger to children, cyclists, and joggers.
- We strongly oppose the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic to the now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West. The current roads cannot handle additional traffic. The road is too narrow with many curves and blind spots. Adding hundreds of additional vehicles a day will definitely lead to accidents and worse road conditions.
- Estrada Calabasa and Paseo de la Tierra are small neighborhood community roads that will not accommodate much more traffic. Increasing the size of these roads will, I believe, have a detrimental impact on the environment as well as the safety of our children.
- Commenter is concerned about safety where the traffic would leave Horcado Ranch Road and enter the new roads.
- There are transportation, utilities, and water issues that militate strongly in favor of the Buckman Road alternative and BLM should give the County ample time to evaluate the broader effects of BLM's choices.

4.5 SAFETY

- We would like to address and oppose the current suggested proposal of an alternative route through the Buckman Road. Hazards include 1)Arroyo Crossing (flooding); 2) Speed control (no signage); 3) ATV's/Dirt Bikes, Off-Road Vehicles (no designated area for use); 4) On-going discharge of firearms; 5) Erosion; 6) Emergency vehicle access; 7) Standing water (rainy season)/lagoon; 8) Vandalism.
- The existing black-checked road (the Horcado Road) is a one-lane road. It is dangerous as it is now used for two-way traffic. It will only become more dangerous if new traffic is added, especially if the traffic includes cement trucks, gravel trucks, and other construction type traffic.
- Sincere consideration must be given to the environmental impact and safety of the community.

- This proposal threatens the open space environment with the potential of development, increased traffic flow through La Tierra and neighboring communities. Not to mention the potential safety issues.
- In addition to being narrow and without shoulders, Paseo la Tierra is also prone to flooding by Alamo Creek, just south of the junction with Estrada Calabasa.
- The use of Paseo de la Tierra, Estrada Calabasa and Horcado Ranch Road as the connecting roads to Santa Fe would impose numerous public safety, emergency evacuation, and environmental hardships and damages on the neighborhood properties fronting those roads.
- As residents of Las Dos whose only access is through these roads, we feel these roads are not designed to accommodate the increase in traffic and construction activities would necessarily follow as this land is developed.
- Not only would the increased traffic make the road more dangerous, it would spoil on of Santa Fe's treasures.
- The proposed application would result in an access road that would connect with Paseo de La Tierra which is a narrow poorly maintained road.
- The speeding on the road creates great danger. The BLM does not have the resources or ability to do anything about this.
- Within the last year an eighteen-wheel tractor trailer jackknifed across the entire Horcado Ranch Road -- where it remained throughout the night. The BLM did not have the resources or ability to do anything about this.
- Because this is such a wide arroyo the crossing will be very dangerous during the times when it floods in the summer.
- I own property in both La Tierra and Las Dos and believe that such routing would constitute a serious safety hazard, not only for those people already living in La Tierra and Las Dos, but also those people traveling to and from the proposed El Monte development.
- Paseo de La Tierra was engineered and constructed as a rural road to handle only the very limited traffic generated by those communities. To subject this road to thousands more daily vehicles to serve El Monte would be poor planning and execution of the very worst sort.
- Providing additional roads to allow greater access to the area would only lead to increased damage and illegal activity thereby endangering the safety, welfare, and property values of our residents.
- I would like to express my opposition for the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic to sections 2, 10, and 15 of T18N, R8E through Paseo la Tierra. Given the potential amount of acreage that could be developed and would be serviced by the proposed access roads, this routing of traffic would greatly exceed the capabilities of Paseo la Tierra, creating a safety hazard for the residents of the La Tierra and Las Dos subdivisions.
- Using these La Tierra roads would heavily increase traffic through what is now a quiet, settled neighborhood, resulting in danger to children, cyclists, and joggers.
- We strongly oppose the proposals presented by the BLM to direct traffic to the now landlocked areas beyond Estrada Calabasa West. The current roads cannot handle additional traffic. The road is too narrow with many curves and blind

spots. Adding hundreds of additional vehicles a day will definitely lead to accidents and worse road conditions.

- Estrada Calabasa and Paseo de la Tierra are small neighborhood community roads that will not accommodate much more traffic. Increasing the size of these roads will, I believe, have a detrimental impact on the environment as well as the safety of our children.
- Commenter is concerned about safety where the traffic would leave Horcado Ranch Road and enter the new roads.

4.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Granting such a proposal would turn our neighborhood roads - Paseo de la Tierra and Estrada Calabasa, and Horcado Ranch Road - into an arterial highway, destroy acres of pinon and juniper trees, and gravely affect the tranquility and quality of life we have now.
- Where BLM lands lie within or adjacent to an urban wildlands interface zone, BLM has a responsibility and duty to the community to consider the impact of its proposed easement.
- Not to mention the impact on the animals that live here, some of which are already endangered (like the lynx).
- Another potential factor in the routing decision has just cropped up. There appears to be an endangered bird nesting near Buckman Road, a northern goshawk.
- Our first objection to the proposals is that they fragment BLM lands unnecessarily and in a way that will threaten the ecology of the area. Before you and your colleagues can evaluate a right-of-way proposal, you must develop a clear understanding of the habitat you are assessing.
- A bobcat crossed Paseo de la Tierra.
- You will discover that the incorporation of a network of roads into the BLM tract will disturb or destroy viewsheds, cultural sites, habitats, migration patterns, and balances of populations and further will endanger wildlife by introducing high-speed and high-volume traffic, causing noise pollution, light pollution, and other problems.
- One of the strongest findings we included in our Northwest Santa Fe County Sector Plan was the potential damage to the ecostructure and archaeological record in the Buckman Corridor.
- The commenter hopes that this area will eventually be accorded special protection due to its fragility and richness.
- The effects on Native American sites of archaeological significance must be determined, as well as the effect on the wildlife habitat.
- Rights-of-way of up to 100 feet are proposed to be revegetated by seeding and natural rainfall. These procedures, under drought conditions currently forecast to last 25 years, would be devastating to the environment.
- A great deal of surveying of animals and plants in the Buckman corridor has been done, and the existing roads were not much of a migration barrier. Increasing traffic might constitute such a barrier.

- The existence of potential alternative access through Buckman Road was raised by several participants at the meeting, including Mrs. Gabrielle Burke. The proposed alternate route was suggested, and rejected, in the course of settling the lawsuit by the Burkes against the Garcias and the BLM. The route was rejected because it requires that a road be built on or over a huge arroyo and, under any alternative, requires destruction of much more vegetation.
- The environmental impact on the BLM property would be major with high speed traffic traveling across a 50-foot right of way in the middle of pristine property. The damage would be to trees, grasses, and other vegetation. Wildlife would be affected and options for future use of the BLM land would be significantly compromised.

4.7 WATER RESOURCES

- If the owners' intent is to develop a residential area then the demands on our non-renewable and depleting water supply would be extremely objectionable.
- We do not oppose some development in NW Santa Fe County but actually, with such limited water; we can't imagine more development at this time.
- Although we do not oppose development per se in Santa Fe County, we have to be sure that concerns over water and other environmental issues are addressed before a drastic, lifestyle-changing decision such as this is made.
- While we do not oppose the development of this land per se, we have concern regarding the impact of this development on the environment and particularly on the water resources of the area.
- It is not a question of opposing development per se but - at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues - it is a question of being sure the impact on the whole county is understood.
- The water situation is critical as we all know and the subdivisions that were created years ago were designed to limit the land use and not allow for major population developments.
- Let us stress that we do not oppose growth in northwest Santa Fe per se, although the impact on water supply of such growth must also be taken into account in any decision of this nature.
- We do not oppose development per se in northwest Santa Fe County, but at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues, we must be sure we understand the impact on the entire county.
- I do not oppose development per se in northwest Santa Fe County, but - at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues - we must be sure we understand the impact on the entire county.
- We do not oppose development per se in northwest Santa Fe County, but at a time of great concern over water and other environmental issues, we must be certain we understand the impact on the entire county.
- There are transportation, utilities, and water issues that militate strongly in favor of the Buckman Road alternative and BLM should give the County ample time to evaluate the broader effects of BLM's choices.

- Certainly you are aware of the acute water situation in our area and this will place a further burden of nearly 1,700 new families on the same inadequate water source.
- We are concerned about the water available for developing that area.

4.8 OUT OF SCOPE

- We have no objection to, and in fact support, the formation of a road maintenance association. We will contribute our fair share to the maintenance of the road.
- We submitted a fully executed road maintenance agreement with our application for the right of way. We have revised the agreement, in accordance with your instructions, and will submit it to you separately.
- Asked about what the BLM was ordered to do by the court as part of the settlement agreement between Garcias and Burkes.
- Further, any grant of an easement wider than 22' must be reviewed in a public forum before the Santa Fe County Commissioners.
- The concern regarding the maintenance of the existing road can be addressed by a road maintenance agreement entered into by all parties that utilize the road, including the El Monte Road Association. However, the opponents to our road do not appear to want to even consider such measures.
- Broadening and improving them (Paseo la Tierra and Estrada Calabasas) would very negatively impact all of us who live here.
- Commenter owns original easement on Horcado Ranch Road. County maintenance standards are not strict enough. Who will fix existing road?
- Is there a mechanism to address future development as a result of this project?
- How do you price an easement? Fair market value for easements?
- What if an easement owner decides not to renew?
- There should be a master plan filed to disclose what is going to happen.
- Concern that Burke and Garcia/BLM settlement is offloading their problem onto the public and BLM.
- Is BLM empowered to consider other development?

4.9 ACEC

- Where BLM lands lie within or adjacent to a wildlands interface zone, BLM has a responsibility and duty to the community to consider the impact of its proposed easement.
- Many volunteers worked many hours to request these BLM lands be declared an "Area of Critical Environmental Concern." This significant report and request should be acted upon and at the very least reviewed before any routing of a road through BLM lands is granted.
- BLM has pending before if a voluminous application to designate the area as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern which makes the impropriety of these proposals obvious. We hereby incorporate that application into our objection letter by reference and ask that you review it in total.

- We suggest that this BLM acreage is truly a New Mexico treasure deserving special management and vigorous protection of its cultural, environmental and scenic attributes. It is irreplaceable. The current proposals despoil the public land.
- The pending request for declaration of these BLM lands as an "Area of Critical Environmental Concern" should be acted upon by BLM before any further rights-of-way are granted.
- The identical issues are involved in the proposed road system and the same threats to the integrity of this Area of Critical Environmental Concern are present. No development in this tract should be allowed, or at minimum, an EIS should be required in order to insure that no irreversible damage is inflicted on the land.
- An Environmental impact statement would enable BLM to make an informed determination, thereby assuring the public that no right-of-way was granted in haste in an Area of Critical Environmental Concern and that our natural resources have been protected in a deliberate manner.
- The pending request for declaring this area one of "Critical Environmental Concern" could provide much of the needed information for an environmental impact statement.

4.10 SCENIC RESOURCES

- I am writing in support of option 3 because it will have the least visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood.
- I am writing in support of option 2 because it will have the least visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood.
- I would also encourage BLM to undertake a careful assessment of the environmental impact the proposed El Monte Association road would have on the beautiful acreage in question.
- Commenter would like rural character of area maintained.
- Before making your decision, please consider the beauty of the current terrain along La Tierra - one of the most beautiful landscapes in America.
- Have visual criteria for each alternative been analyzed?
- Is there a way for a visual analysis to condition forward?

4.11 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- In terms of development, we have a serious concern about water and the impact of excessive growth in this area.
- The thought of the proposed road widening which will threaten our well, our entry wall, our tree plantings, our driveway, as well as the substantial increase in traffic make us sick with regret.
- We strongly encourage the applicant and the BLM to consider the critical impact on the region.
- If the roads are widened, it will have an adverse effect on the adjacent environment and a significant disruption of its immediate ecosystem.

- To increase the size of the road would do much to destroy the character of the neighborhood that brought us to this area.

4.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES

- You will discover that the incorporation of a network of roads into the BLM tract will disturb or destroy viewsheds, cultural sites, habitats, migration patterns, and balances of populations and further will endanger wildlife by introducing high-speed and high-volume traffic, causing noise pollution, light pollution, and other problems.
- One of the strongest findings we included in our Northwest Santa Fe County Sector Plan was the potential damage to the ecostructure and archaeological record in the Buckman Corridor.
- The commenter hopes that this area will eventually be accorded special protection due to its fragility and richness.
- The effects on Native American sites of archaeological significance must be determined, as well as the effect on the wildlife habitat.
- The proposed road in all likelihood would affect a number of archeological sites.

4.13 SOCIOECONOMICS

- Providing additional roads to allow greater access to the area would only lead to increased damage and illegal activity thereby endangering the safety, welfare, and property values of our residents.
- Social and economic impact on surrounding landowners need to be considered.
- This in turn will adversely affect the property values which are based upon this quiet lifestyle, not to mention the almost certain degradation of the environment.

4.14 DOCUMENT REQUEST

- I ask to be mailed copies of all notices of public meetings and copies of all determinations on this matter by the BLM.
- I ask to be mailed copies of all notices of public meetings and copies of all determinations on this matter by the BLM.
- I request that I be given notice of any future meetings and of any decisions. Also I would appreciate it if I could be furnished with a copy of the Walbridge application and report.

4.15 INDIRECT IMPACTS

- BLM is considering widening Paseo de la Tierra to as much as 50 feet. This would result in us losing land that buffers us from the street, and thousands of cars would pass daily in front of our rural home.
- What the BLM proposes will increase traffic, noise, pollution, and lower well water tables in a drought beaten area already suffering from dangerously low levels of well water for the people of La Tierra, Las Dos, and neighboring communities.

- Sincere consideration must be given to the environmental impact and safety of the community.

4.16 MITIGATIONS

- Rights-of-way of up to 100 feet are proposed to be revegetated by seeding and natural rainfall. These procedures, under drought conditions currently forecast to last 25 years, would be devastating to the environment.
- The project also states that in the process they will revegetate about 13 acres. The commenter thinks that 13 acres is not enough, maybe a little along the lines of 15-17 acres would be a little better for everyone.
- The routing of any right-of-way for access to the El Monte Association properties (Zannie Garcia and the Ortiz family interests) should be configured to cause the least damage possible to the environment.

4.17 RECREATION

- The commenter is particularly fearful of the impact of increased traffic on Buckman Road, and of off-road vehicles in the hills accessible along it.
- The very high use of the surrounding area by off-road vehicles have and continue to severely damage a fragile, historical, and important environment.

4.18 TRIBAL CONSULTATION

- A full EIS should be conducted and the regulations under NHPA should be followed which includes contact with State Historic Preservation Officer and appropriate tribes and Pueblos whose religious sites and ancestor sites may be significantly impacted.

4.19 INFRASTRUCTURE

- There are transportation, utilities, and water issues that militate strongly in favor of the Buckman Road alternative and BLM should give the County ample time to evaluate the broader effects of BLM's choices.

5.0 EL MONTE RIGHT-OF-WAY PLANNING DISCUSSION MEETING

On April 17, 2003, the *El Monte Right-of-Way Planning Discussion Meeting* was hosted by the BLM from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at the Sweeney Convention Center at 201 West Marcy Street in Santa Fe, New Mexico. A letter announcing the meeting was sent out on April 11 to persons on the project mailing list derived from the February 5, 2003 public scoping meeting and respondents during the scoping period. Display advertising publicizing the right-of-way planning meeting was placed on April 12, 2003 by the BLM, Taos Field Office in the Albuquerque Journal North, Los Alamos Monitor, and Santa Fe New Mexican newspapers. The purpose of the meeting was to increase the public's understanding of the analysis process for proposals including the EA, as well as describe the BLM decision space or jurisdiction. A question and answer period was opened at the end of the information meeting and the following questions and comments were fielded. The questions and comments below have not been incorporated into the scoping comment totals above, and they have not been characterized as scoping comments in that they were not provided within

the formal scoping period. However, all comments below have been categorized using the same methods to group them as were used to categorize the scoping comments above.

5.1 NEPA PROCESS COMMENTS

- How long does scoping last?
- Will the EA document disclose incremental decision?
- How did the BLM know whether to conduct an EA or EIS?
- How do you determine significance?
- Notify us if the project goes to an EIS.
- Is the decision just a yes or no decision?
- What recourse is available if the El Monte Roads Association does not like the decision?
- Are there simplified maps showing ownership boundaries? I would like maps ASAP.
- Confusion over role of SWCA and Tetra Tech. What does BLM do? What do contractors do?
- How do we know there will be no bias?
- Look at impacts on and off BLM lands. Have we contacted Santa Fe County? How does the public know about the proponent's proposal?
- BLM has heard from Tesuque.

5.2 LAND USE COMMENTS

- What is the County planning framework? Has the County provided that information? Commenter believes rules are actually pretty restrictive. There needs to be a joint discussion with the County.
- Is there a mandate to select shortest route?
- What is a degree of access?
- Is the applicant's use of the land disclosed?
- How would lands be exchanged? Can applicants buy BLM?

5.3 AREA OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACEC) COMMENTS

- How does the ACEC affect this project?
- Why didn't the PNM project go through?
- Do we need to hire someone to consider ACEC?
- What is an ACEC?

5.4 TRAFFIC COMMENT

- What would County say about traffic in various areas?

6.0 CONCLUSION

Scoping was conducted in compliance with the CEQ regulations (40 C.F.R 1501.7) and BLM's NEPA Handbook to accomplish the following:

- Determine the scope and substantive issues that will be analyzed in depth in the environmental analysis;
- Identify and eliminate from further detailed study issues that are not relevant or substantive or that are covered by prior environmental review; and

- Identify and eliminate from detailed study issues that are being evaluated in other environmental reviews

The scoping process was designed to actively seek and involve the many diverse communities interested or potentially impacted by the El Monte Roads EA. The goal of the scoping process and this scoping report is to create an open and accessible decision-making process that results in decisions that are technically sound, are health and safety conscious, address public values and concerns, and give the public the opportunity to be involved in the decision.